REMARKS

Claims 1, 47 and 82-97 remain in this application. Claims 49-81 have been canceled. Claims 1, 47, 82 and 87 have been amended. Claims 88-97 have been added. The applicant submits that the pending claims are now allowable, as set forth in more detail below.

Claim Objections-Informalities

The examiner objected to claims 47, 54-71 and 83-84 because claim 47 had two items labeled "(b)". Claim 47 has been amended to correct this informality.

The objection to claim 50 has been rendered moot by the cancellation of that claim.

The examiner objected to claim 82 for the use of the phrase "the supporting plate area". Claim 82 has been amended to change the phrase to "where the printing plate is in direct contact with the stationary supporting bed", which finds antecedent basis in the base claim 47.

The examiner objected to claim 87 for double labeling of items. The amended claim 87 does not contain such informalities.

Claim Rejections Based on Prior Art

The examiner rejected claims 1, 47, 51-61, 63, 67-68, 82 and 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Landsman*, US 4,764,815. Claims 51-61, 63 and 67-68 have been cancelled. The applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 47, 82 and 87, as amended, are not anticipated by *Landsman*.

Specifically, each of the independent claims 1, 47 and 87 requires *direct contact* between the printing plate that is being transported and a *stationary* support bed or area. *Landsman* does not disclose this feature. The applicant has discussed the *Landsman* reference and the difference between its teachings and the applicant's invention on page 13, paragraphs 1-5, of the Reply dated September 23, 2003, to the previous Office Action. The above-referenced portion of the prior Reply is incorporated herein by reference. The examiner has noted in the current Office Action (page. 15) his appreciation of the applicant's arguments in paragraphs 3-5 of the above-referenced Reply regarding the benefits of the invention of the instant application with regard to the prior art. Nonetheless, the examiner

stated that the claim language did not sufficiently distinguish the invention from the prior art of record. The applicant believes that the current amendment to claims 1, 47 and 87, with the above-mentioned feature of direct contact between the printing plate and stationary support, sufficiently distinguish the invention from the prior art. Claims 1, 47 and 87 are therefore not anticipated by *Landsman*. Claim 82, now amended to depend on claim 47, includes further features and associated advantages, and therefore is also not anticipated by *Landsman*.

The examiner rejected claims 49-50, 62, 64-66, 69-70, 72-77 and 80-81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Landsman* in view of various other references. The cancellation of these claims renders the rejection moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 85 and 86.

The examiner objected to claims 78 and 83-84 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The applicant has cancelled claim 78 and incorporated the limitations of claim 78 into the new claim 97, which the applicant believes is allowable, as set forth in the following section. Claims 83-84 ultimately depend on claim 47. The applicant submits that because claim 47 is allowable, claims 83-84 are also allowable.

New Claims

The applicant has added new claims 88-97. Each of claims 88-93 is ultimately dependent on one of claims 1, 47 and 87, which the applicant believes is allowable, as discussed above. Independent claim 94 includes, among other things, the feature "with one face of the printing plate in sliding contact with the support surface", which is absent from *Landsman* and other cited references. New claim 94 is therefore allowable. Claims 95-97, being dependent on claim 94 and include further features and advantages, are therefore also allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

MICHEL MOULIN

By: _____

Tong Wu, #43,361
FAEGRE & BENSON LLP
2200 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3901
612/766-6804

Dated: April 1, 2004

M2:20614964.01